

REMARKS

I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 21 – 29 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Office Action states that “machine readable medium” is non-statutory subject matter. (Office Action dated July 10, 2008; page 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, in order to expedite prosecution, claims 21 – 29 were amended to recite “computer readable medium.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the claim rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 101.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 1, 21, and 26 were amended to recite transmitting converted first conference-endpoint data not only to the second endpoint, but also back to the first endpoint from which the first conference-endpoint data originated. The specification provides an example of the claimed feature. As shown in Figure 1, participant A may provide audio data, such as “sales are up” (Specification, ¶ [029]). The conferencing system 102 converts the audio data, for example, into text data. The converted data may be transmitted back to participant A, as well as to participant B (Specification, ¶ [030]). Participant A may use the converted data to ensure that participant B is receiving a true and accurate conversion of the audio data. Another benefit of the claimed subject matter is that participant A may “store and later manipulate the conference data in different forms” (specification, ¶ [030]).

A. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Koch, Davis, Cruickshank, Cutaia

Claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 9 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch (U.S. Publication No. 2006/0146994) in view of Davis et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0021344). Claim 6 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch in view of Davis et al. and further in view of Cruickshank (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,468). Claim 10 is rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch in view of Davis et al. and further in view of Cutaia (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0225501).

Koch, Davis, Cruickshank, and Cutaia fail to disclose transmitting converted first conference-endpoint data to the first endpoint and second endpoint. Koch discloses translating data from an originating device and transmitting the translated data to a destination device. (see Koch, ¶ [0006] and ¶ [0038]). Davis discloses transcribing a speech input from a telephone into a text message and transmitting the text message to an instant messaging device (see Davis, Abstract; ¶ [0009]; and ¶ [0016]). Cruickshank discloses performing speech recognition on received voice (S604), translating text into language specified by each participant (S608), and transmitting the textual representation to other participant(s) in the teleconference (S610) (see Cruickshank, Figure 6 and column 11, lines 9 – 50). Cutaia discloses using speech feature vectors with text-to-speech conversion. The converted data is transmitted from one endpoint to another endpoint. Even if a reason exists to combine Koch with Davis, Cruickshank, or Cutaia, none of these combinations would teach or suggest the claimed subject matter. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Dependent claims 2 – 10 depend from allowable claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Nakamura, Anvekar, Smyth, Koch, Davis

Claims 11 – 13 and 20 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0015550) in view of Anvekar et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0054844) and further in view of Smyth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,007,098). Claims 14 – 17 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Anvekar et al. and further in view of Smyth et al. and further in view of Koch. Claims 18 and 19 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Anvekar et al. and further in view of Smyth et al. and further in view of Koch and further in view of Davis et al.

Nakamura, Anvekar, Smyth, Koch, and Davis fail to disclose transmitting converted first conference-endpoint data to the first endpoint and second endpoint. Nakamura discloses receiving input from a transmitting party (S10), converting the received input (S20 – S30), and sending the converted transmission data to a

destination telephone terminal (S35) (see Nakamura, Figure 4, ¶ [0044] - [0046]). Anvekar discloses a short message service (SMS) system that provides SMS messages to a respective destination (see Anvekar, col. 5, lines 9 – 24). Smyth discloses a method that uses predefined rules to decide how the video signal from any one of the participants is to be transmitted to the other participants (see Smyth, col. 2, lines 61 – 66). Even if a reason exists to combine Nakamura with Anvekar, Smyth, Koch, or Davis, none of these combinations would teach or suggest the claimed subject matter. Therefore, independent claim 11 is allowable over the cited references.

Dependent claims 12 – 20 depend on allowable claim 11 and are allowable for at least this reason.

C. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Nakamura, Geofroy, Koch, Davis

Claims 21, 22, and 24 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Geofroy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,124,163). Claims 23 and 25 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Geofroy et al. and further in view of Koch. Claims 26 – 29 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Geofroy et al. and further in view of Koch and further in view of Davis et al.

Geofroy fails to disclose transmitting converted first conference-endpoint data to the first endpoint and second endpoint. Geofroy discloses a media server that may transcode between different codec types and bit rates, but does not transmit converted data back to an originator. Therefore, even if a reason exists to combine Nakamura with Geofroy, the combination would not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter. Therefore, independent claim 21 is allowable over the cited references.

Dependent claims 22 – 29 depend on allowable claim 21 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons presented above, the Assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 13, 2008



Jay Q. Knobloch, Reg. No. 57,347
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200